[1st November 1932

(c) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to clause (b) of question No. 95 answered on the 4th August 1932.

Grazing and compounding fees collected in the Thodikana reserve.

* 239 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of animals licensed to graze last year in the Thodikana reserve forest in South Mangalore division;

(b) the grazing fees collected therefrom last year;

(c) the number of cattle impounded by forest subordinates in Thodikana in May and in June this year;

(d) the rate of impounding fee to be paid for each buffalo or cow; and

(e) the compounding fees collected in June 1932 from the villagers whose cattle strayed into the forest area closed to grazing?

A.—(a) 235 { 221 cows or bulls. 14 buffaloes.

(b) Rs. 91-10-0.

(c) 19 { 12 cows or bulls. 7 buffaloes.

(d) Rs. 2 per buffalo and Re. 1 per cow or bull.

(e) Nil.

Withdrawal of grazing rights in certain forests in Puttur and Kasaragod taluks.

* 240 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Medinadka block of reserved forest in Puttur taluk and the Bantaje block in Kasaragod range have been closed to grazing for a period of one year from 30th June 1932;

(b) whether the alleged reason for the withdrawal of the grazing rights in these blocks is an excess of forest fires in the course of the last year; and

(c) whether any enquiry has been made into the number and the causes of such fires and if so, the particulars of such enquiry and its results?

A.—(a) A part of Medinadka West Reserved Forest and the whole of Bantaje Reserved Forest have been closed to grazing.

(b) The closures have been enforced on account of fires.

(c) There were 13 cases of fire in these reserves during the years 1931 and 1932. In some cases enquiries into the origin of fire were made by the Range Officer and in others by the forest guards concerned. There was definite proof of incendiarism in one case; while in one case the report definitely says that the fire was not wilfully caused. The origin of the rest can only be matter of surmise.